

## Testimony to CT Judiciary Committee

March 11, 2015

Dear Members of the CT Judiciary Committee,

My name is John Gori and I am a resident of Milford, CT.

I am writing this testimony to express my OPPOSITION to Bills; SB650, HB6848, and HB6962.

I OPPOSE Bill SB650; AN ACT CONCERNING TEMPORARY RESTRAINING ORDERS.

The reason I oppose this bill is because it violates the FIFTH and FOURTEENTH Amendments of the Constitution. "No state shall deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law". In this bill, there is a clear violation of a person's right to 'due process of law'; by having his / her property being confiscated before being heard by a judge regarding 'accusations' made against him / her. While we all can agree, we want to keep the innocent safe and the criminals incarcerated; our law guarantees a person the right to Due Process before being deprived of Liberty and Property. Statistics show that half of the accusations (requests for restraining orders) have no merit for a restraining order. Every citizen has the right to due process of law as stated (above) in our Constitution. I beseech thee not to pass this Un-Constitutional bill.

I OPPOSE BILL 6848; AN ACT PROTECTING VICTIMS OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE.

The reason I oppose this bill is because it too removes 'the Due Process of Law' regarding a person being accused of domestic violence. This bill 'removes' the specific language of "after notice and an opportunity to be heard has been provided to such person". How is it that some in our Legislature would willingly remove 'the Constitutional guarantee' of Due Process Of Law in the name of safety. Please work together to protect people who are victims (and potential) victims of domestic abuse, without Violating a person's Constitutional rights. One suggestion would be to provide safe (homes) places for those making accusations, until (and after) a proper hearing takes place. (This bill also removes the provision of allowing a FFL dealer to hold onto the firearms in question, and puts the Gov't. as sole holder – Why?).

I OPPOSE BILL HB6962; AN ACT CONCERNING FIREARM SAFETY.

The reason I oppose this bill is because it unfairly dumps more laws and penalties on the law abiding gun owner (in his own home). Let me ask you a question? Where do you draw the line? Would you write the same bill, and in the place of firearm – insert 'prescription medicine'? Prescription medicine can be very dangerous in the wrong hands. Should the Government make

a law stating that a person is responsible for the actions of others if they (others) should find their (not locked up) medication and is then taken (by an adult) from their home, and causes harm or death? Would you write the same bill, and in the place of firearm – insert ‘car keys’? A person can take (Steal) your (not locked up) car keys, borrow (Steal) your car and crash it (intentionally or un-intentionally) and cause harm or death. Would you hold the owner of the keys (car) responsible for the results? How about holding the person who ‘committed’ the act(s) responsible. I believe the great majority of Citizens lock up their firearms, but do they not have the right to have a firearm in their own home easily accessible to them (not children – which some of the legislature wants to change) if they so choose? And shouldn’t all adults be responsible for ‘their own’ actions? And shouldn’t the Government not ‘pick and choose’ which things ‘adults’ should and shouldn’t be responsible for?

Thank you for reading my testimony. I understand your responsibility to enact right and just laws. I ask you to oppose these Bills because of their overreaching violations of Constitutional rights to strive for some form of (safety) protection.